

REMARKS

This Amendment is submitted in response to the Final Office Action of October 5, 2006 (hereinafter “the Office Action”) and the supplemental Final Office Action of November 9, 2006 (hereinafter “the Supplemental Office Action”). Claims 1-7, 9-11, 14, and 16-23 are amended. Claims 1-7, 9, 12, and 14-27 remain pending.

All references to the claims, except as noted, will be made with reference to the claim list above beginning on page 2. If there is any confusion or questions regarding any aspect of this Request for Reconsideration, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned.

Status of Application – Finality of the outstanding Office Action

This Application is currently under a Final Rejection. Applicant respectfully requests that the finality of the rejection in the Office Action and the Supplemental Office Action be withdrawn. Applicant notes that the Office Action and the Supplemental Office Action cite new art and contain new grounds of rejection. These new grounds of rejection were not necessitated by Applicant’s Amendments, since Applicant has not submitted any amendments to the claims since before the previous Final Office Action was issued on February 27, 2006. The rejections in the February 27, 2006 Final Office Action were overcome by arguments alone, in the form of a Pre-Appeal Brief, which was filed on May 26, 2006.

In addition to the reasons stated above, Applicant respectfully refers to the Petition under 37 C.F.R. § 1.181 submitted concurrently herewith for additional reasoning and the legal basis for Applicant’s well-founded belief that the finality of the Office Action and the Supplemental Office Action is premature and improper. Reconsideration of the finality of the Office Action and Supplemental Office Action is therefore respectfully requested.

Amendment

In general, the claims are amended to better define the invention over the prior art. Lines 2-4 of amended claim 1 are supported, for example, at lines 18-23 of page 11 and lines 14-23 of page 12 of the Application as filed. Lines 5-6 of claim 1 are supported, e.g., at 14-23 of page 12 and page 7, line 24. Lines 7-9 of claim 1 are supported, e.g., at page 7, lines 11-12 and page 13, lines 7-8. Lines 10-13 of claim 1 are supported, e.g., at page 28, lines 19-20 and page 7, lines 12-14. Lines 14-16 of claim 1 are supported, e.g., at page 24, lines 20-23 and

page 26, lines 28 through 31. Lines 17-20 of claim 1 are amended only for consistency in terminology and to improve readability. Changes to lines 21-22 of claim 1 are supported, e.g., at page 14, lines 23-24. Changes to lines 25-30 of claim 1 are supported, e.g., at page 32, lines 9-15.

Amendments to claims 2 are supported, e.g., at page 15, lines 2-5 and page 18, lines 9-13 and 17-20. Amendments to claim 3 are primarily semantic in nature and are made to maintain consistency in terminology. Amendments to claim 4 are supported, e.g., at page 16 lines 4-6 and page 27, lines 5-6. Amendments to claim 5 merely places claim 5 into independent form. Amendments to claim 10 are supported, e.g., at page 18, lines 9-13 and page 32, lines 11-15.

Amendments in lines 2-3 of claim 11 are supported, e.g., at lines 18-23 of page 11 and lines 14-23 of page 12 of the Application. Lines 4-5 are supported, e.g., at page 7, lines 11-12 and page 13, lines 7-8. Amendments to lines 10-11 of claim 11 are supported, e.g., at page 14, lines 23-24. Amendments to lines 15-17 are supported, e.g., page 15, lines 25 and page 18, lines 9-13 and 17-20. Other amendments in claim 11 are semantic and do not materially affect the scope of the claim.

Amendments to claim 14 are semantic and are not intended to materially affect the scope of the claims. Amendments to claim 16 are supported, e.g., at page 16 lines 4-6 and page 27, lines 5-6. Claim 17 is amended to place it into independent form. Amendments to claim 20 through 21 are semantic and are not intended to materially affect the scope of the claims. Amendments to claim 21 are either semantic in nature, or, for lines 13-14, are supported, e.g., at page 16 lines 4-6 and page 27, lines 5-6. The amendment to claim 22 is semantic and is not intended to materially affect the scope of the claim.

Amendments to lines 3-4 of claim 23 are supported, e.g., at page 7, lines 11-12 and page 13, lines 7-8. Lines 6-11 of claim 23 are supported, e.g., at page 15, lines 8-10; page 24, lines 20-23; and page 26, lines 28 through 31. Other amendments to claim 23 are either cancellations or are semantic.

No new matter is being introduced by this Amendment.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicant notes with appreciation the indication that claims 5-7 and 17-19 contain allowable subject matter.

Claim Rejections – Prior Art

Claims 1-4, 8-16, and 20-27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) for being anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,625,652 issued to Miller et al., hereinafter referred to as, “Miller.” Applicant respectfully traverses because, with respect to claims 8 and 10, the rejection is obviated by cancellation of claims 8 and 10, and with respect to the remaining claims, Miller fails to disclose each and every feature set forth in the claims.

Claim 1, for instance, sets forth, *inter alia*, “re-registering each target device connected to the network by transmitting a unicast signal to the master initiator, the re-registering being performed periodically at a selected re-registration interval” (claim 1, lines 14-16). Miller does not mention re-registering devices at a selected re-registration interval. Claims 2-4, 8, 9, and 10 depend from claim 1 and are therefore distinguished from Miller for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

Claim 11 sets forth, *inter alia*, “adding a new target device to a separate list of target devices at each slave initiator” (claim 11, lines 15-16). Miller does not mention maintaining a separate list by a slave initiator. Claims 12, 14-16, and 20 depend from claim 11 and are therefore distinguished from Miller for at least the same reasons as claim 11.

Claim 21 sets forth, *inter alia*, “each multicast has a sequence number, the sequence number being incremented every time the new target information is included in the multicast” (claim 21, lines 13-14). Miller does not show a sequence number included in the multicast. Claim 22 depends from claim 21 and is therefore distinguished from Miller for at least the same reasons as claim 21.

Claim 23 sets forth a system having a master initiator and at least one target device which “is configured to periodically re-register with the master initiator at a re-registration interval” (claim 23, lines 9-10). Miller does not describe a target device configured to re-register with the master initiator at a re-registration interval. Claims 24 through 27 depend from claim 23 and therefore are distinguished from Miller for at least the same reason as claim 23.

For the reasons identified above, Applicant respectfully submits that the instant Application is now in condition for allowance. A Notice of Allowance is therefore respectfully requested.

If the Examiner has any questions concerning the present Request for Reconsideration, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at (408) 774-6933. If any other

fees are due in connection with filing this Request for Reconsideration, the Commissioner is also authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 50-0805 (Order No. ADAPP085A2). A duplicate copy of the transmittal is enclosed for this purpose.

Respectfully submitted,
MARTINE PENILLA & GENCARELLA, LLP


Leonard Heyman
Reg. No. 40, 418

710 Lakeway Drive, Suite 200
Sunnyvale, CA 94085
Telephone: (408) 749-6900 Ext. 6933
Facsimile: (408) 749-6901
Customer Number 25920